



REMARKS

This is in response to the Office Action mailed on March 23, 2004. Applicant has amended claim 3 and added new claims 23-35. Also with this Amendment, Applicant has corrected minor errors in the specification and drawings. Reconsideration of the application, as amended, is respectfully requested.

In the Office Action, the Examiner required election of one of two distinct inventions: Invention I corresponding to claims 1-18 drawn to a method for forming a beveled writing pole; and Invention II corresponding to claims 19-22 drawn to a beveled writing pole. Applicant hereby elects, with traverse, to prosecute Invention I, subject to reconsideration by the Examiner.

It is respectfully requested that the Examiner reconsider the requirement for restriction. At least portions of Invention I and Invention II are believed to be sufficiently related so they should be examined in one case. Even though slightly different in language, they are directed toward the same invention. In particular, independent claim 1 of Invention I describes a method of forming the product of Invention II. Applicant respectfully disagrees with the Examiner's assessment that the product of Invention II "can be made by another and materially different process such as without a polishing process." In particular, independent claim 1 of Invention I does not contain the "polishing process" identified by the Examiner. Rather, independent claim 1 describes a method of forming the beveled writing pole of Invention II, but without describing any specific process technique. Accordingly, Applicant submits that Invention I and Invention II are sufficiently related such that they should be examined in the same case. Reconsideration of the requirement for restriction is respectfully requested.